

WEAK CLEAN INDEX OF A RING

Dhiren Kumar Basnet

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tezpur University,
Napaam, Tezpur-784028, Assam, India.
Email: dbasnet@tezu.ernet.in*

Jayanta Bhattacharyya

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tezpur University,
Napaam, Tezpur-784028, Assam, India.
Email: jbhatta@tezu.ernet.in*

Abstract: Motivated by the concept of clean index of rings [3], we introduce the concept of weak clean index of rings. For any element a of a ring R with unity, we define $\chi(a) = \{e \in R \mid e^2 = e \text{ and } a - e \text{ or } a + e \text{ is a unit}\}$. The weak clean index of R is defined as $\sup\{|\chi(a)| : a \in R\}$ and it is denoted by $\text{Win}(R)$, where $|\chi(a)|$ denotes the cardinality of the set $\chi(a)$. In this article, we characterize rings of weak clean indices 1, 2 and 3.

Key words: Clean ring, weak clean ring, clean index, weak clean index.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 16N40, 16U99.

1 INTRODUCTION

In this article we assume ring R to be associative with unity unless otherwise stated, we also assume modules (and bimodules) to be unitary. The Jacobson radical, group of units, set of idempotents and set of nilpotent elements of a ring R are denoted by $J(R)$, $U(R)$, $\text{idem}(R)$ and $\text{nil}(R)$ respectively. Notion of *clean ring* was first introduced by Nicholson [6], which was later generalized by Ahn and Andreson[5] as *weakly clean ring* defined as a ring R in which each element $r \in R$ can be written as $r = u + e$ or $r = u - e$ for some $u \in U(R)$ and $e \in \text{idem}(R)$. Further, Lee and Zhou [3, 4] introduced and studied *clean index* of rings, which actually motivated us to introduce and study weak clean index of rings.

Definition 1.1. For any element a of R , we define $\chi(a) = \{e \in \text{idem}(R) \mid a - e \in U(R) \text{ or } a + e \in U(R)\}$. The weak clean index of R is defined as $\sup\{|\chi(a)| : a \in R\}$ and it is denoted by $\text{Win}(R)$, where $|\chi(a)|$ denotes the cardinality of the set $\chi(a)$.

2 BASIC PROPERTIES

Some basic properties related to weak clean index are presented here as a preparation for the article.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a ring and $e, a, b \in R$. Then following hold:*

- (i) *For a central nilpotent $n \in R$, $|\chi(n)| = 1$. Whereas for a central idempotent $e \in R$, $|\chi(e)| \geq 1$, thus for any ring $\text{Win}(R) \geq 1$.*
- (ii) *If $a - b \in J(R)$ then $|\chi(a)| = |\chi(b)|$.*
- (iii) *$e \in \chi(a)$ then $1 - e \in \chi(1 - a)$ or $1 - e \in \chi(1 + a)$. Converse holds if $2 \in J(R)$.*
- (iv) *Let σ be an automorphism or anti-automorphism of R . Then $e \in \chi(a)$ iff $\sigma(e) \in \chi(\sigma(a))$; so $|\chi(a)| = |\chi(\sigma(a))|$. In particular $|\chi(a)| = |\chi(uau^{-1})|$, where u is a unit of R .*
- (v) *If a ring R has at most n units or at most n idempotents, then $\text{Win}(R) \leq n$. In particular, if R is a local ring then $\text{Win}(R) \leq 2$.*
- (vi) *If R is local, then $\text{Win}(R) = 2$ iff $R/J(R) \not\cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.*
- (vii) *Let R be a clean ring with $2 \in U(R)$. Then $\text{Win}(R) = |\chi(2^{-1})|$, in other words $\text{idem}(R) = \chi(2^{-1})$.*

Proof (i) Let a be a central nilpotent such that $a^n = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we have $a = (a + 1) - 1$ is a weak clean expression, hence $1 \in \chi(a)$; $|\chi(a)| \geq 1$. If possible let $e \neq 1 \in \chi(a)$, then there exists a $u \in U(R)$ such that $a = u + e$ or $u - e$. If $a = u - e$, by using binomial expansion and the fact that $a^n = 0$ we have $0 = (u - e)^n = u^n - \binom{n}{1}eu^{n-1} + \binom{n}{2}eu^{n-2} - \cdots + (-1)^{n-1}eu + (-1)^ne$, implies $u^n \in eR$ contradicting the fact that $e \neq 1$. Next if $a = u + e$, similarly we get a contradiction. let e be a central idempotent then $e = 1 - (1 - e)$ i.e., $1 - e \in \chi(e)$ and therefore $|\chi(e)| \geq 1$.

(ii) Let $w = a - b \in J(R)$. If $e \in \chi(a)$, we have $a + e \in U(R)$ or $a - e \in U(R)$.

Case 1: $u = a + e \in U(R)$ implies $u = b + w + e \Rightarrow b + e = u - w \in U(R)$ and therefore $e \in \chi(b)$.

Case 2: $v = a - e \in U(R)$ implies $b - e = v - w \in U(R)$ and therefore $e \in \chi(b)$.

Thus $\chi(a) \subseteq \chi(b)$ and by symmetry we get $\chi(b) \subseteq \chi(a)$ resulting $\chi(a) = \chi(b)$.

(iii) Let $e \in \chi(a)$, then we have $a + e \in U(R)$ or $a - e \in U(R)$. Let $a - e \in U(R)$ then we have $(1 - a) - (1 - e) = e - a \in U(R)$, so $1 - e \in \chi(1 - a)$. Similarly if $a + e \in U(R)$ then we have $(1 + a) - (1 - e) = a + e \in U(R)$, therefore $1 - e \in \chi(1 + a)$. Conversely if $(1 - e) \in \chi(1 - a)$, we have $(1 - a) - (1 - e) = u \in U(R)$

or $(a - 1) + (1 - e) = v \in U(R)$, that is $a - e = -u$ or $a - e = v$, so in this case $e \in \chi(a)$. If $(1 - e) \in \chi(1 + a)$, we have $(1 + a) - (1 - e) = u \in U(R)$ or $(a + 1) + (1 - e) = v \in U(R)$ this implies $a + e = u$ or $a - e = v - 2 \in U(R)$, as $2 \in J(R)$, hence we get $e \in \chi(a)$.

(iv) and (v) are straightforward.

(vi) If R is a local ring then we have $\text{Win}(R) \leq 2$, as $\text{idem}(R) = \{0, 1\}$. Let $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, that is, R is uniquely clean. If possible let $\text{Win}(R) = 2$, that is there exists at least an element $a \in R$ such that $\{0, 1\} = \chi(a)$. So, $a \in U(R)$ and $a - 1 \in U(R)$ or $a + 1 \in U(R)$. If $a \in U(R)$ and $u = a - 1 \in U(R)$, then we have two clean expressions for a which is a contradiction. Similarly $a \in U(R)$ and $u = a + 1 \in U(R)$, give two clean expressions for u , which is a contradiction, hence $\text{Win}(R) \neq 2$. Conversely, let $\text{Win}(R) = 1$, then $\text{In}(R) = 1$ as $\text{In}(R) \leq \text{Win}(R)$, hence the result follows by **Theorem 2.1** of [1]

(vii) Let $e \in \text{idem}(R)$ and let $2 \in U(R)$, now we have $(2^{-1} - e) \in U(R)$, as $2(1 - 2e)$ is inverse of $2^{-1} - e$, therefore $\text{idem}(R) \subseteq \chi(2^{-1})$, hence $\text{Win}(R) = |\chi(2^{-1})|$. $\square$

In a ring R , $q \in R$ is called quasi-regular element, if there is a $p \in R$, such that $q + p + qp = 0 = p + q + pq$. The set of all all quasi-regular elements of ring R is denoted by $Q(R)$.

Lemma 2.2. *If S is a subring of a ring R , where R and S may not share same identity, then $\text{Win}(S) \leq \text{Win}(R)$.*

Proof For $a \in R$, let $J(a) = J_1(a) \cup J_2(a)$, where $J_1(a) = \{q \in Q(R) : (a - q)^2 = a - q\}$ and $J_2(a) = \{q \in Q(R) : (q - a)^2 = q - a\}$. Claim: $\text{Win}(R) = \sup\{|J(b)| : b \in R\}$. Note that $U(R) = \{1 + q : q \in Q(R)\}$. For any $a \in R$, $\chi(a) = \{(a - 1) - j : j \in J_1(a - 1)\} \cup \{j - (a - 1) : j \in J_2(a - 1)\}$, therefore $|\chi(a)| = |J(a - 1)|$. Thus $\text{Win}(R) = \sup\{|J(b)| : b \in R\}$. Because $Q(S) \subseteq Q(R)$ it follows that $\text{Win}(S) \leq \text{Win}(R)$.

Proof of $|\chi(a)| = |J(a - 1)|$:

Let $e \in \chi(a)$, we have

$$\Leftrightarrow a - e = u \text{ or } a + e = u, \text{ for some } u \in U(R).$$

$$\Leftrightarrow a - u = e \text{ or } u - a = e,$$

$$\Leftrightarrow a - 1 - q = e \text{ or } 1 + q - a = e, \text{ for some } q = 1 + u \text{ as } U(R) = 1 + Q(R).$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (a - 1) - q = e \text{ or } q - (a - 1) = e,$$

$$\Leftrightarrow e \in J_1(a - 1) \text{ or } e \in J_2(a - 1). \square$$

Theorem 2.3. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, then the following are equivalent for a ring R*

- (i) $\text{Win}(R[[x]]) = k$.
- (ii) $\text{Win}(R[x]) = k$.
- (iii) R is abelian and $\text{Win}(R) = k$.

Proof By above **Lemma 2.2** we have $\text{Win}(R) \leq \text{Win}(R[x]) \leq \text{Win}(R[[x]])$. Suppose that R is not abelian and e be a non-central idempotent of R , let $er \neq re$ for some $r \in R$. So either $er(1-e) \neq 0$ or $(1-e)re \neq 0$, without loss of generality we may assume that $er(1-e) \neq 0$. For $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned} a &:= [1 + er(1-e)] - e \\ &= [1 + er(1-e)(1+x^i)] - [e + er(1-e)x^i] \end{aligned}$$

are infinitely many distinct weak clean expressions of a in $R[x]$. Now suppose R is abelian, it is easy to see that idempotents of $R[[x]]$ are all in R and for any $\alpha = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots \in R[[x]]$, $\chi_{R[[x]]}(\alpha) \subseteq \chi_R(a_0)$. Thus $|\chi(\alpha)| \leq |\chi(a_0)|$, therefore $\text{Win}(R[[x]]) \leq \text{Win}(R)$ and consequently the result follows. $\square$

3 Rings with weak clean index 1, 2 and 3

In this section we try to characterize the rings of weak clean index 1, 2 and 3.

Theorem 3.1. $\text{Win}(R) = 1$ iff R is abelian and for any $0 \neq e^2 = e \in R$, $e \neq u+v$ for any $u, v \in U(R)$.

Proof ($\Rightarrow$) Let $e^2 = e \in R$. For any $r \in R$, $1-e = [1+er(1-e)] - [e+er(1-e)]$ are two weak clean expression of $1-e$; so $e = [e+er(1-e)]$, that is $re = ere$, similarly we have $er = ere$, so R is abelian. Suppose that $0 \neq e^2 = e \in R$, $e = u+v$ for some $u, v \in U(R)$, then $v = v+0 = -u+e$ are two weak clean expressions of v , implies $|\chi(v)| = 2$, which is a contradiction.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $a \in R$ has two weak clean expressions, $a = u_1+e_1$ or u_1-e_1 and $a = u_2+e_2$ or u_2-e_2 , for $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(R)$, $e_1 \neq e_2$ and $u_1, u_2 \in U(R)$.

Case I: if $a = u_1+e_1 = u_2+e_2$, we have $e_1-e_2 = u_2-u_1$. Define $f := e_1(1-e_2)$, then $f = f^2 \in R$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} f &= [e_2 + (u_2 - u_1)](1 - e_2) \\ &= u_2(1 - e_2) - u_1(1 - e_2) \\ &= [u_2(1 - e_2) + e_2] - [u_1(1 - e_2) + e_2]. \end{aligned}$$

As $[u_2(1-e_2)+e_2], [u_1(1-e_2)+e_2]$ are units in R , therefore $f = 0$, hence $e_1 = e_1e_2$. Similarly we have $e_2 = e_1e_2$, a contradiction, thus $\chi(a) \leq 1$.

Case II: If $a = u_1 + e_1 = u_2 - e_2$, implies $e_1 + e_2 = u_2 - u_1$. Define $f := e_1(1 - e_2)$, then $f = f^2 \in R$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f &= [-e_2 + (u_2 - u_1)](1 - e_2) \\ &= u_2(1 - e_2) - u_1(1 - e_2) \\ &= [u_2(1 - e_2) + e_2] - [u_1(1 - e_2) + e_2]. \end{aligned}$$

As $[u_2(1 - e_2) + e_2], [u_1(1 - e_2) + e_2]$ are units in R , so $f = 0$, hence $e_1 = e_1e_2$. Similarly we get $e_2 = e_1e_2$, that is $e - 1 = e_2$, a contradiction, thus $\chi(a) \leq 1$.

Case III: If $a = u_1 - e_1 = u_2 - e_2$, we have $e_1 - e_2 = u_1 - u_2$. Define $f := e_1(1 - e_2)$, then $f = f^2 \in R$.

$$\begin{aligned} f &= [e_2 + (u_1 - u_2)](1 - e_2) \\ &= u_1(1 - e_2) - u_2(1 - e_2) \\ &= [u_1(1 - e_2) + e_2] - [u_2(1 - e_2) + e_2]. \end{aligned}$$

Since R is abelian, so $[u_2(1 - e_2) + e_2], [u_1(1 - e_2) + e_2]$ are units. So, as in above case $\chi(a) \leq 1$. Thus combining above cases we conclude that $\text{Win}(R) = 1$. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $R = A \times B$ be direct product of rings A and B , such that $\text{Win}(A) = 1$, then $\text{Win}(R) = \text{Win}(B)$.*

Proof Since A, B are subrings of R , so by **Lemma 2.2**, $\text{Win}(B) \leq \text{Win}(R)$. If $\text{Win}(B) = \infty$, then $\text{Win}(R) = \infty$ and so we have $\text{Win}(R) = \text{Win}(B)$. Next let $\text{Win}(B) = k < \infty$ be a positive integer, so there is a $b \in B$, such that $|\chi(b)| = k$. Now for $(0, b) \in R$, $|\chi(0, b)| = k$, hence $\text{Win}(R) \geq k$. Suppose that $\text{Win}(R) > k$. Then there exists $(a, b) \in R$ such that (a, b) has at least $k + 1$ weak clean expressions in R . Let g be an integer such that $1 \leq g \leq k$ and let $(a, b) = \begin{cases} (u_i, v_i) + (e_i, f_i), & i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, g \\ (u_j, v_j) - (e_j, f_j), & j = g+1, g+2, \dots, k, k+1. \end{cases}$

are $k + 1$ distinct weak clean expressions for (a, b) , such that no two (e_i, f_i) 's are equal. Now, $a = u_i + e_i = u_j - e_j$, ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, g$ and $j = g + 1, g + 2, \dots, k + 1$) are weak clean expressions of a in S . Since $|\chi(a)| \leq 1$, so all e_i 's and e_j 's are equal. So $k + 1 = |\chi((a, b))|$

$$\begin{aligned} &= |\{(e_i, f_i), (e_j, f_j) | i = 1, 2, \dots, g \text{ and } j = g + 1, g + 2, \dots, k + 1\}| \\ &= |\{e_i, e_j | i = 1, 2, \dots, g; j = g + 1, \dots, k\}| \times |\{f_i, f_j | i = 1, 2, \dots, g; j = g + 1, \dots, k\}| \\ &= |\chi(a)| \times |\chi(b)| \\ &= |\chi(b)| \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction and this completes the proof. $\square$

Definition 3.3. A ring R is said to be elemental if idempotents of R are trivial and $1 = u + v$ for some $u, v \in U(R)$.

Theorem 3.4. *For a ring R , $\text{Win}(R) = 2$ iff one of the following holds:*

- (i) R is elemental.
- (ii) $R = A \times B$, where A is elemental ring and $\text{Win}(B) = 1$.
- (iii) $R = \begin{pmatrix} A & M \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$, where $\text{Win}(A) = \text{Win}(B) = 1$ and ${}_A M_B$ is a bimodule with $|M| = 2$.

Proof ($\Leftarrow$) If (i) holds then by the definition of elemental ring, we have $1 = u + v$ for some $u, v \in U(R)$, therefore by **Theorem 3.1**, $\text{Win}(R) > 1$. By **Lemma 2.2** $\text{Win}(R) \leq |\text{idem}(R)| = 2$, thus $\text{Win}(R) = 2$.

If (ii) holds then $\text{Win}(R) = 2$ by (i) and **Lemma 3.2**.

If (iii) holds, for $\alpha_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & w \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : w \in M \right\} \subseteq \chi(\alpha_0)$. So, $\text{Win}(R) \geq |\chi(\alpha_0)| \geq |M| = 2$. For any $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a & x \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \in R$,

$$|\chi(\alpha)| = \left| \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e & w \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in R : e \in \chi(a), f \in \chi(b), w = ew + wf \right\} \right|.$$

Since $|M| = 2$, $|\chi(a)| \leq 1$ and $|\chi(b)| \leq 1$, it follows that $|\chi(\alpha)| \leq 2$ and hence $\text{Win}(R) = 2$.

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose R is abelian, as $\text{Win}(R) \neq 1$, so there exists $(0 \neq)e = e^2 \in R$ such that $e = u + v$, where $u, v \in U(R)$. So we have $e = eu + ev$, where $eu, ev \in U(eR)$, hence $\text{Win}(eR) \leq 2$. But $\text{Win}(eR) \leq \text{Win}(R) = 2$ by **Lemma 2.2**. From $R = A \times B$ where $A = eR$ and $B = (1 - e)R$ it follows, $\text{Win}(B) = 1$. If A has a non trivial idempotent f then $A = fA + (1 - f)A$ where, $f = fu + fv$ and $1 - f = (1 - f)u + (1 - f)v$, where $fu, fv \in U(fA)$ and $(1 - f)u, (1 - f)v \in U((1 - f)A)$, thus by **Theorem 5** [3], we have $\text{In}(fA) \geq 2$ and $\text{In}((1 - f)A) \geq 2$, so $\text{In}(A) \geq 2 \times 2 = 4$, as $\text{In}(R) \leq \text{Win}(R)$, hence a contradiction. Thus (i) holds if $e = 1$ and (ii) holds if $e \neq 1$. Suppose R is not abelian and let $e^2 = e \in R$ be a non central idempotent. If neither of $eR(1 - e)$ and $(1 - e)Re$ is zero, then take $0 \neq x \in eR(1 - e)$ and $0 \neq y \in (1 - e)Re$ to get $1 - e = (1 + x) - (x + e) = (1 + y) - (y + e)$. Therefore $|\chi(1 - e)| \geq 3$, which is a contradiction. So without loss of generality we can assume that $eR(1 - e) \neq 0$ and $(1 - e)Re = 0$. The Peirce decomposition of R gives

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} eRe & eR(1 - e) \\ 0 & (1 - e)R(1 - e) \end{pmatrix}.$$

As above $2 = \text{Win}(R) \geq |eR(1 - e)|$; so $|eR(1 - e)| = 2$. Write $eR(1 - e) = \{0, x\}$. If $\text{Win}(eRe) = 2$, then there exists an $a \in R$ such that $|\chi(a)| = 2$. Thus we have

following cases

Case I: Let $a = u_1 + e_1 = u_2 + e_2$, where $u_1, u_2 \in U(eRe)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(eRe)$.

If $e_1x = 0$, we have for $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in R$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

are three distinct weak clean expressions of A in R , which implies

$|\chi(A)| \geq 3$, that is a contradiction. If $ex = x$ then for $B = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & x \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

are three distinct weak clean expressions of B in R , which implies $|\chi(B)| \geq 3$, that is a contradiction.

Case II: Let $a = u_1 - e_1 = u_2 + e_2$, where $u_1, u_2 \in U(eRe)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(eRe)$.

So if $e_1x = 0$, we have for $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in R$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

are three distinct weak clean expressions of B in R , which implies

$|\chi(B)| \geq 3$, that is a contradiction. If $ex = x$ then for $B = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & x \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

are three distinct weak clean expressions of B in R , which implies $|\chi(B)| \geq 3$, again a contradiction.

Case III: Let $a = u_1 - e_1 = u_2 - e_2$, where $u_1, u_2 \in U(eRe)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(eRe)$, we get a contradiction similar to case I.

This shows that $\text{Win}(eRe) = 1$, similarly $\text{Win}((1-e)R(1-e)) = 1$.

Theorem 3.5. $\text{Win}(R) = 3$ iff $R = \begin{pmatrix} A & M \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$, where $\text{Win}(A) = \text{Win}(B) = 1$ and ${}_A M_B$ is a bimodule with $|M| = 3$.

Proof ($\Leftarrow$) For $\alpha_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & w \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : w \in M \right\} \subseteq \chi(\alpha_0)$. So,

$\text{Win}(R) \geq |\chi(\alpha_0)| \geq |M| = 3$. For any $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a & x \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \in R$,

$$|\chi(\alpha)| = \left| \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e & w \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in R : e \in \chi(a), f \in \chi(b), w = ew + wf \right\} \right|,$$

as $|M| = 3$, $|\chi(a)| \leq 1$ and $|\chi(b)| \leq 1$ it follows $|\chi(\alpha)| \leq 3$, hence $\text{Win}(R) = 3$.

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $\text{Win}(R) = 3$, from the proof of **Theorem 3.4** we see that an abelian ring not satisfying condition (i) and (ii), contains a subring whose weak clean index is greater than 4, therefore R must be non abelian.

Let e be a non central idempotent in the ring R , then Peirce decomposition of R gives

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} eRe & eR(1-e) \\ (1-e)Re & (1-e)R(1-e) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $A = eRe$, $B = (1-e)R(1-e)$, $M = eR(1-e)$, $N = (1-e)Re$. Suppose $|M| \neq 0$ and $|N| \neq 0$. As $\chi(1-e) \supseteq \{e-x, e-y : x \in M, 0 \neq y \in N\}$, it follows that $3 = \text{Win}(R) \geq |\chi(1-e)| > |M| + |N| - 1$, therefore $|M| = |N| = 2$. Write $M = \{0, x\}$, $N = \{0, y\}$. Note that $2x = 0 = 2y$. If $xyx = 0$, then $(x+y+xy+yx)^4 = 0$ and $\chi(1-e) \supseteq \{e, e-x, e-y, e+x+y+xy+yx\}$, so $\text{Win}(R) \geq 4$, a contradiction. If $xyx \neq 0$, then $(x+y+xy+yx)^4 = 0$ and $\chi(2-e) \supseteq \{1-e, 1-e+x, 1-e+y, 1-e+x+y+xy+yx\}$, therefore $\text{Win}(R) \geq 4$, a contradiction. Hence $xyx \neq 0$ and $xyy \neq 0$. It follows that $xyx = x$ and $xyy = 0$. Let $f = xy$ and $g = yx$, then clearly f, g are idempotents. So we have $R \supseteq L := \begin{pmatrix} fRf & M \\ N & gRg \end{pmatrix}$. By **Lemma 2.2**, $\text{Win}(L) \leq 3$, but for $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ y & g \end{pmatrix}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ y & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ y & g \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} f & x \\ y & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & g \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ y & g \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} f & x \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} f & x \\ 0 & g \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ y & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

that is $|\chi(\alpha)| \geq 5$ in L , which is a contradiction. So $|M| \neq 0, |N| \neq 0$ is not possible.

Without loss of generality we may assume that $|N| = 0$. So $R = \begin{pmatrix} A & M \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$, clearly $2 \leq |M| \leq 3 = \text{Win}(R)$. By **Lemma 2.2**, $\text{Win}(A) \leq 3$. To prove that $|M| = 3$, on contrary let $M = \{0, x\}$. Assume $\text{Win}(A) = 2$, then there exists least one $a \in A$ such that $|\chi(a)| = 2$.

Case I: Let $a = u_1 + e_1 = u_2 - e_2$ be two distinct weak clean expressions of a in A , where $u_1, u_2 \in U(A)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(A)$. Then $e_1x = u_2x - u_1x - e_2x = -e_2x + x - x = -e_2x = e_2x$. If $e_1x = 0$, then for $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ we have $\chi(\alpha) \supseteq \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e_i & w \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} : i = 1, 2, w \in M \right\}$. Showing that $\text{Win}(R) \geq 4$, which is not possible. If $e_1x = x$, then for $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have $\chi(\alpha) \supseteq \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e_i & w \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : i = 1, 2, w \in M \right\}$, showing that $\text{Win}(R) \geq 4$, which is a contradiction.

Similarly in **Case II**, letting $a = u_1 + e_1 = u_2 + e_2$ be two distinct weak clean and in **Case III**, let $a = u_1 - e_1 = u_2 - e_2$ be two distinct weak clean expressions of a in A , where $u_1, u_2 \in U(A)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(A)$, we get contradictions. Therefore $\text{Win}(A) = 1$. Similarly $\text{Win}(B) = 1$. Now by **Theorem 3.4**, we have $\text{Win}(R) = 2$, a contradiction, hence $|M| = 3$.

Now it remains to show that, $\text{Win}(A) = \text{Win}(B) = 1$. For $e^2 = e \in A$, we have $M = eM \oplus (1 - e)M$, without loss of generality let $|eM| \neq 0$. On contrary let us assume $\text{Win}(A) > 1$. So we have $a \in A$ such that $|\chi(a)| \geq 2$, that is, we have at least two distinct weak clean expressions of a in A .

Case I: If $a = u_1 + e_1 = u_2 - e_2$, where $u_1, u_2 \in U(A)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(A)$ such that $e_1 \neq e_2$. Let $M = e_1M$ then for $w \in M$ and $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ we have $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & -w \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & w \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, implies $\chi(\alpha) \geq 4$, a contradiction. If $e_1M = 0$, $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ we have $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} e_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & -w \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & w \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, implies $\chi(\alpha) \geq 4$, a contradiction.

Similarly in **Case II**, letting $a = u_1 + e_1 = u_2 + e_2$ be two distinct weak clean and in **Case III**, letting $a = u_1 - e_1 = u_2 - e_2$ be two distinct weak clean expressions of a in A , where $u_1, u_2 \in U(A)$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \text{idem}(A)$ we get contradictions. Therefore we have $\text{Win}(A) = 1$. Similarly $\text{Win}(B) = 1$.

References

- [1] H. Chen, (2011) On uniquely clean rings, *Comm. Algebra* 39: 189-198.
- [2] A. J. Diesl, Classes of Strongly Clean Rings, Ph. D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, (2006).
- [3] T. K. Lee and Y. Zhou, Clean index of rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 40, 2012, 807–822.
- [4] T. K. Lee and Y. Zhou, Rings of clean index 4 and application, *Comm. Algebra* 41, (2013), 238–259.
- [5] M-S. Ahn and D.D. Anddreson, Weak clean rings and almost clean rings, *Rocky mount. Jorn. math.* 36, (2006) no 3, 783-798.
- [6] W.K. Nicholson, Lifting idempotents and exchange rings⁽¹⁾. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* (1977). 229 : 269 – 278.